

Remarks

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Rodriguez for the indication of allowable subject matter. In the office action dated October 2, 2003 the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-7, 21 and 24-26 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter APA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,778,787 to Cannon, claims 11 and 13-15 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,519,715 to Takashi et al. (hereinafter Takashi) in view of Cannon, APA and U.S. Patent No. 6,327,112 to Ide et al. (hereinafter Ide), claims 2, 3, 22 and 23 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over APA in view of Cannon and further in view of U.S. Application No. 2002/0008928 to Takahashi, claim 12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Takashi, APA, Cannon and Ide in further view of U.S. Application No. 2002/0101674 to Ichihara et al., claims 9, 10, 28 and 29 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over APA and Cannon in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,532 to Ikeda, claim 16 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Takashi in view of Cannon, APA and Ide, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,771,131 to Pirzadeh, and claim 17 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Takashi in view of Cannon, APA and Ide, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,932,352 to Culp. By this amendment, Applicant's attorney amends claims 1, 11 and 21, and cancels claims 8, 18 and 27. Claims 8, 18-20 and 27 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection, the Examiner is invited to consider the following remarks.

Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended to include the subject matter of now canceled claims 8, 18 and 27, respectively. As such, no new matter has been added and independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are believed to be allowable.

Regarding claims which depend from independent claims 1, 11 and 21, Applicant contends that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 11 and 21 are patentable. Moreover, Applicant contends these claims recite further limitations, in addition to the limitations of claims 1, 11 and 21, which render these claims additionally patentable.

Consequently, in view of the above and in the absence of better art, Applicant's attorney respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance which allowance is respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due for the filing of this paper. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to discuss prompt resolution of any remaining issues necessary to place this case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Allen Gill, et al.

By



Thomas W. Saur

Reg. No. 45,075

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: December 17, 2003

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351